UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/597,856	08/10/2006	Keun-Jin Lee	P07662US00	7234

22885 7590 03/17/2008

MCKEE, VOORHEES & SEASE, P.L.C.
801 GRAND AVENUE
SUITE 3200
DES MOINES, IA 50309-2721

EXAMINER	
KAPLAN, HAL IRA	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2836	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/17/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/597,856	LEE, KEUN-JIN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Hal I. Kaplan	2836	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10 August 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *10 August 2006* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, requires the specification to be written in "full, clear, concise, and exact terms." The specification is replete with terms which are not clear, concise and exact. The specification should be revised carefully in order to comply with 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. The specification and claims appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors.

2. Examples of some unclear, inexact or verbose terms used in the specification are: In the title and throughout the specification and claims, the invention is referred to as a “multifunctional multi-tap (concent) of intercepting a stand-by electric power”. It appears this should be “multifunctional outlet strip for intercepting a stand-by electric power”. In addition, it is unclear what the term “concent” means, as a search did not return any definition or use of the term "concent" having any relation to electrical outlet strips or electric power. It appears the phrase “multi-tap (concent)” should be changed to “outlet strip” throughout the specification. Throughout the specification, the terms "main lead-in hole" and "auxiliary lead-in holes" have been used. It appears these should be "main outlet" and "auxiliary outlets". For examination purposes, it has been assumed that the lead-in holes are outlets, and that the claimed invention is a multifunctional outlet strip with a main outlet and auxiliary outlets, that can be connected or turned on or off as described and claimed. The terms "single-acted” and “interlocked” are frequently used throughout the specification but are not defined. For examination

purposes, it has been assumed that “interlocked” means that the outlets are controlled in a master-slave configuration with the main outlet acting as the master, so that all of the auxiliary outlets are controlled simultaneously, and that “single-acted” means that the auxiliary outlets can be controlled individually. Figure 2 illustrates the output control part having six relay devices; however, throughout the specification, the relay device of the output control part is frequently referred to in the singular. It is thus unclear whether the output control part has only one relay device or a plurality of relay devices. For examination purposes, it has been assumed that the output control part has a plurality of relay devices, as illustrated, with one relay device for each outlet.

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

Page 2, line 11, “200” should be deleted”. Page 2, line 13, “used by being” should be deleted. Page 2, line 15, “in blocking” should be “of blocking”. Page 2, line 16, “leakage of current” should be “continuous connection”. Page 2, line 22, “multi-tap” should be “outlet strip”. Page 2, line 23, “the state" should be deleted. Page 3, line 2, “intercepted” should be deleted. Page 3, line Page 3, line 16, “not to be” and “wasted” should be deleted. Page 3, lines 23-24, “as the aforementioned meaning” should be deleted. Page 4, line 7, “its own function” should be deleted. Page 5, line 5, “makes the interlocking control” is unclear. Page 5, line 6, “appliances” should be “appliances.”. Page 5, line 19, “are on/off” should be “are switched on/off”. Page 6, line 1, “an disorder” should be “a malfunction”. Page 6, line 4, “the rectification” should be “a rectification”. Page 6, line 6, “the condition” should be deleted. Page 6, line 17, “controlling the appliance” should be “switching the appliances”. Page 6, line 18, “is led

into each lead-in hole, as a standby state" should be "are plugged into each outlet, in a standby state". Page 6, line 20, "condition" should be "function". Page 6, lines 24-25, "method of multifunctional multi-tap (concent) of intercepting" should be "method for a multifunctional outlet strip for intercepting". Page 7, line 2, "by a sensor" should be "using a sensor". Page 7, lines 2-3, "as a standby state" should be "into a standby state". Page 7, line 3, "in case that there is" should be "if there is". Page 7, lines 3-4, "light as a result of the determination" should be "light detected by the sensor". Page 7, line 6, "in case that" should be "if". Page 7, line 8, "interlocked as a result of step (c)" should be "determined to be interlocked in step (c)". Page 7, line 10, "in case that" should be "if". Page 7, line 11, "as a result of step (d)" should be deleted. Page 7, lines 12-13, "in case that" should be "if". Page 7, lines 13-14, "as a result of step (d)" should be deleted. Page 7, lines 15-16, "in case that" should be "if". Page 7, line 17, "are single-acted as a result of step (c)" should be "are determined to be single-acted in step (c)".

Page 9, line 13, "disorder of an appliance" should be "malfunction of the appliance". Page 10, line 4, "determines the detection signal" is unclear. Page 10, lines 5-7 are unclear. Page 10, line 6, "is lead in each lead-in hole" should be "plugged into an outlet". Page 10, lines 7-8, "with the standby or power-saving state" is unclear. Page 11, line 15, "detailedly explained later" should be "explained later in detail". Page 13, lines 6-7, "determines the detection signal" is unclear. Page 13, line 18, "with a relay device" should be "with relay devices". Page 13, line 25, "the power" should be "the power part". Page 14, line 15, "down-transformed" should be "stepped down".

Page 14, line 16, "down" should be "step-down". Page 14, line 24, "down-transformed" should be "stepped down". Page 15, line 7, "down-transformed through the down-transformer" should be "stepped down through the step-down transformer". Page 17, line 3, "control the standby" should be "switch each outlet to the standby". Page 18, lines 11-12, "controlled with" should be "switched into". Page 18, line 12, it is unclear whether the standby and power saving states are different states or different names for the same state. For examination purposes, it has been assumed that they are different states, as indicated at page 27, lines 14 and 22-23, and page 28, line 25.

Page 18, lines 17-18 are unclear. No "illuminance state" is defined in the specification or drawings. Page 19, line 9, "only where" should be "only the case where". Page 19, line 24, "signal of" should be "signals from". Page 20, line 1, "the terminal" should be "the respective terminals". Page 20, line 1, "lead-in hole is" should be "outlet(s) is/are". Page 20, line 4, "of the switch" should be "from the switch". Page 20, line 14, "connected by" should be "connected to". Page 20, line 23, "signal regarding the use of the" should be "signal from the". Page 20, line 25, "regarding" should be "corresponding to". Page 21, line 10, "receives the signal according to the detection through" should be "receiving a detection signal through". Page 21, lines 13-15 are unclear. Page 21, line 15, "if any of the two sensors does not perceive" should be "if neither of the two sensors perceives". Page 21, line 17, "with" should be "in". Page 21, line 23, "relay" should be "relays". Page 21, line 24, "is connected" should be "are connected". Page 21, line 25, "signal" should be "signals". Page 22, line 19,

"connected by" should be "connected to". Page 22, line 23, "as the standby" should be "in the standby". Page 22, line 25, "flowing the" should be "flowing through the".

Page 23, line 2, "detection signal to the terminal" should be "detection signals to the terminals". Page 23, line 20, "to the appliance" should be "to each appliance". Page 23, lines 23-24, "appliance with different capacity" should be "appliances have different capacities". Page 23, line 24, "is inputted" should be deleted. Page 24, line 3, "switch 5-1 operates" should be "switch 5-1 is operated". Page 24, line 21, "according to the state" should be deleted. Page 24, line 22, "element is" should be "elements are". Page 24, line 23, "the appliance" should be "each appliance". Page 25, line 13, "operation" should be deleted. Page 26, line 1, "as a standby" should be "in a standby". Page 26, lines 5-6, "of the determination of S12" should be deleted (S12 is a reference numeral in Figure 9, not a value to be determined). Page 26, line10, "for interlocking function" should be deleted. Page 26, line 12, "detected" should be "monitored". Page 26, line 23, "as a result of S15" should be deleted. Page 27, line 5, "as a result of S16" should be deleted. Page 27, line 9, "relay" should be "relays". Page 27, line 11, "under" should be "in". Page 27, line 15, "as the result of S16" should be deleted. Page 27, line 19, "under" should be "in". Page 27, line 24, "as a result of S15" should be deleted. Page 28, line 7, "as a result of S12" should be deleted. Page 28, line 10, "as a result of S20" should be deleted. Page 28, line 14, "as a result of S21" should be deleted. Page 28, line 21, "[S18]" should be "[S23]".

Page 29, line 1, "as a result of S20" should be deleted. Page 29, line 11, "as a result of S24" should be deleted. Page 29, line 17, "as a result of S24" should be

deleted. Page 29, line 20, "[S25]" should be "[S26]". Page 29, line 21, "[S20, S24, S25]" should be "[S24, S25, S26]". Page 30, line 15, "as a standby" should be "in a standby". Page 30, lines 20-21, "as a result of the determination of S32" should be deleted. Page 31, line 1, "they are" should be "it is". Page 31, line 8, "as a standby" should be "in a standby". Page 31, line 10, "determining" should be "monitoring". Page 31, line 24, "some of the" should be "multiple". Page 32, lines 24-25, "as a standby" should be "in a standby". The passage from page 32, line 25 - page 33, line 2 is unclear.

4. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required:

The subject matter of claim 2 is not described or disclosed in the specification. A user's operation of a reset button to resume the supply of electric power once the reason for the over-current is eliminated is not supported by the specification. The reset button of claim 2 and array resistance of claim 9 are not described or disclosed.

5. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The following title is suggested: "A Multifunctional Outlet Strip For Intercepting a Stand-By Electric Power and a Control Method Employing The Same".

Drawings

6. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the reset button of

claim 2 and the constant voltage circuit of claim 6 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

7. The drawings are objected to because of the following informalities: In Figures 9 and 10, steps S14 and S34, “put as a standby state” should be “put in a standby state".

8. Figure 1 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g).

9. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: CT1 in Figure 7 (see page 20, lines 8-21 of the specification). Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either “Replacement Sheet” or “New Sheet” pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

10. Claims 1-23 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claims 1-23, the phrase "multifunctional multi-tap (concent) of intercepting" in the preamble should be "multifunctional outlet strip for intercepting", and “lead-in hole” should be “outlet”.

Claim 1, line 6, “an disorder” should be “a malfunction”. Claim 1, line 8, "multi-tap" should be "outlet strip". Claim 1, lines 9-10, "the rectification, smoothing and voltage regulation process" lacks proper antecedent basis. Claim 1, line 12, "sets the condition whether or not a sensor is used” should be “sets which sensor(s) is/are used”. Claim 1, line 14, “the switching signal” lacks proper antecedent basis.

Claim 1, line 19, “the detected signal” lacks proper antecedent basis. Claim 1, line 24, “the appliance” lacks proper antecedent basis. Claim 1, lines 24-25, “which is led into each lead-in hole, as a standby state” should be “which is plugged into each outlet in a standby state”.

Claim 2, line 8, "the reason" lacks proper antecedent basis. Claim 3, line 14, "the range" lacks proper antecedent basis. Claim 4, line 21, "the power part" lacks proper antecedent basis. Claim 4, line 21, "down transformer' should be "step-down transformer". Claim 4, line 22, "down-transforming" should be "stepping down". Claim 4, line 3, "control" should be "control part". Claim 5, line 7, “the operating voltage” lacks proper antecedent basis. Claim 6, line 13, “down-transforming” should be “stepping down”. Claim 10, line 16, “reference illuminance” should be “reference resistance”. Claim 10, line 18, “the motion” lacks proper antecedent basis. Claim 11, line 23, “regarding” should be “corresponding to”. Claim 11, line 24, “regarding" should be “corresponding to”. Claim 11, line 25, “change of illuminance and” should be “change of illuminance and/or”. Claim 13, line 19, “outputs” should be “outputting”. Claim 13, line 20, “multi-tap (concent)” should be “outlet strip”.

Claim 14, line 25, “the number” lacks proper antecedent basis. Claim 14, line 25, “of the current adjusting switch" should be "of current adjusting switches". Claim 15, line 6, "the control operation" lacks proper antecedent basis. Claim 15, line 7, "a built-in relay" should be "one or more built-in relays" (see Figure 2). Claim 15, line 8, "an appliance, which is led" should be "appliances, which are led". Claim 17, line 23, “lead-in hole as a standby” should be “outlet in a standby”. Claim 17, lines 23-24, “in case that” should be “if”. Claim 17, lines 24-25, “as a result of the determination” should be deleted. Claim 17, line 1, “lead-in hole is" should be "outlets are". Claim 17, line 4, "in case that" should be "if". Claim 17, lines 5-6, "as a result of step (c)" should be deleted. Claim 17, line 8, "lead-in holes in case that" should be "outlets if". Claim 17, line 9, “as a result of step (d)" should be deleted. Claim 17, line 11, "lead-in holes in case that" should be "outlets if". Claim 17, line 12, “as a result of step (d)” should be deleted. Claim 17, line 14, "turning off" should be "turning on" (see Figure 9, step S19). Claim 17, line 15, “lead-in holes, in case that” should be “outlets, if”. Claim 17, line 17, “as a result of step (c)” should be deleted. Claim 18, line 21, “of the step (c)” should be “in step (c)”. Claim 19, line 2, “of the step (d)” should be “in step (d)”. Claim 20, line 10, “predetermined number of” should be deleted.

Claim 21, line 15, "1" should be "h" and "in case that" should be "if". Claim 21, line 15, “the timer” lacks proper antecedent basis. Claim 21, line 16, "as a result of the step (a)" should be deleted. Claim 21, line 17, “2" should be “i”. Claim 21, lines 17-18, “of the timer" should be deleted. Claim 21, line 19, “3” should be “j”. Claim 21, line 20, “in case that” should be “if”. Claim 21, line 21, “as a result of the step (2)” should be

deleted. Claim 21, line 22, “4” should be “k”. Claim 21, line 23, “in case that” should be "if". Claim 21, line 25, "as a result of the step (3)" should be deleted. Claim 21, line 1, "5" should be "l". Claim 21, line 4, "as a result of the step (4)" should be deleted. Claim 21, line 5, "6" should be "m“. Claim 21, line 7, “in case that” should be “if”. Claim 21, line 8, “as a result of the step (4)" should be deleted. Claim 22, line 13, "A" should be "n". Claim 22, line 15, "in case that" should be "if". Claim 22, line 17, "as a result of the step (3)" should be deleted. Claim 22, line 18, "B" should be "o". Claim 22, line 19, "in case that" should be "if". Claim 22, line 21, "as a result of the step (A)" should b“ deleted. Claim 22, line 22, “C” should be “p”. Claim 22, line 23, “in case that” should be “if”. Claim 22, line 25, “as a result of the step (A)” should be deleted. Claim 23, line 5, “of illuminance” should be “in light”.

Appropriate correction is required.

11. Claims 14 and 20 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.

Claim 14 recites the number of current adjusting switches being one or more. Claim 13, from which claim 14 depends, recites “a current adjusting switch” (see claim 13, line 17), which includes one or more, and thus claim 14 fails to recite any additional features not recited in claim 13.

Claim 20 recites a main outlet, which has been in a standby state, presently being used, and all of the predetermined number of auxiliary outlets interlocked with the

main outlet are turned on. Claim 17, from which claim 20 depends, recites all of these features in lines 23-25 and 7-9. The recitation "since the main lead-in hole, which has been in a standby state, is presently being used" does not recite a positive limitation and has therefore not been given patentable weight.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

12. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

13. Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1, line 12 refers to setting a "condition whether or not a sensor is used". This recitation is unclear. Claim 1, lines 15-16 recites a sensor part as a feature of the claimed invention. It thus appears that at least one sensor is always used, and thus there can never be a condition where a sensor is not used (i.e. the condition that a sensor is used is always satisfied). For examination purposes, it has been assumed that, at all times, either the light sensor alone or both the light and body sensors are used, and that the user sets, via one or more switches, whether the light sensor is used alone, or whether both the light and body sensors are used.

Claim 1, lines 22-23 recite the limitation "determines the detected signal of the sensor". It is unclear exactly what is being determined and how the control part is functioning. For examination purposes, it has been assumed that the control part receives the detected signal from the current detecting part, and the user's switching

signal; determines, based on the detected signal, whether or not a current is flowing through the current detecting part; and outputs the on/off control signal accordingly.

Claims 2-16 inherit these deficiencies.

Claims 17 and 21 recite the steps of determining whether or not the main lead-in hole is currently used, and turning on or off all of the predetermined number of interlocked auxiliary lead-in holes (outlets) depending on the determination result. Claim 22 recites the steps of determining whether or not the predetermined number of single-acting auxiliary lead-in holes are presently being used, and turning on or off the auxiliary lead-in holes depending on the determination result. The determining steps, as recited, would require that the auxiliary lead-in holes are neither on nor off at the time of the determination, which is impossible. It is not clear how the determining step is carried out, or what is meant by the phrase "being used". For examination purposes, it has been assumed that “being used” means that power to the main and all auxiliary lead-in holes (outlets) is on (standby state) at the time of the determining steps, as the supply of power is required for the determining steps to be performed. Claims 18-20 and 23 inherit these deficiencies.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

14. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

15. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

16. Claims 17-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the US patent of Niv (6,940,272) in view of the US patent of Kitamura et al. (6,670,597).

As to claims 17 and 20, Niv discloses a control method of a multifunctional outlet strip comprising the steps of: (b) setting a main outlet (106) in a standby (on) state (see column 4, lines 18-21); (c) determining which auxiliary outlets (104) are interlocked (see column 4, lines 21-24) or single-acted (see column 6, lines 30-40 and 51-57); (d) determining whether or not the main outlet (106) is currently used, if a predetermined number of auxiliary outlets (104) are interlocked (see column 4, lines 21-26); (e) turning on all of the predetermined number of the interlocked auxiliary outlets (104) if the main outlet (106) is currently used (see column 4, lines 21-24); (f) turning off all of the predetermined number of the interlocked auxiliary outlets (104) if the main outlet (106) is not currently used (see column 4, lines 24-26); and (g) turning on all of the predetermined number of the single-acted auxiliary outlets (104), if a predetermined number of auxiliary outlets (104) are single-acted (see column 6, lines 31-57). Niv does not disclose the step of (a) determining whether there is a change in light by a sensor.

Kitamura discloses determining whether there is a change in light by a sensor (A); and setting a switch (Q) in a standby (on) state, if there is a change in light (see column 15, lines 19-62 and Figure 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have modified Niv by adding a light sensor to switch the main outlet (106) on if there is a change in light, so that the system will automatically turn on when a user enters the room to use it and turns on a light.

As to claim 18, in the system of Niv, the determination in step (c) can be made based on an on/off signal inputted according to a user's switching operation (312) (see column 6, lines 51-57).

As to claim 19, in the system of Niv, the determination in step (d) is made based on an on/off signal depending on an electric current flowing into the main outlet (main outlet in standby/on state) (see column 4, lines 21-26).

As to claim 21, Niv discloses the steps of (h) operating a timer (124) and (i) determining whether a predetermined time period (delay) has passed (see column 4, lines 35-44); and (j)-(m) performing the determining steps and the steps of turning on and off all the predetermined number of the interlocked auxiliary outlets as set forth above, if the predetermined time has passed.

As to claim 22, Niv discloses the step of (n) determining whether the predetermined number of the auxiliary outlets which are single-acting are presently being used and turning on and off all the predetermined number of the single-acting auxiliary outlets (steps (o)-(p)) depending on whether the single-acting auxiliary outlets are being used (see column 6, lines 31-57).

17. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Niv in view of Kitamura as applied to claim 22 above, and further in view of the US patent of Molnar et al. (6,731,024).

As to claim 23, Niv in view of Kitamura disclose all of the claimed features, as set forth above, except for the claimed body-detecting sensor. Molnar discloses a multifunctional outlet strip including a body-detecting sensor (60) for detecting a movement of a human body (see column 2, lines 59-63; column 3, lines 52-61; column 4, lines 31-34; and Figure 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have modified Niv in view of Kitamura by adding a body-detecting sensor, in order to save energy by only activating the outlet strip when a user enters the room.

Allowable Subject Matter

18. Claims 1-16 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the objections and rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

19. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Claims 1-16 contain allowable subject matter because none of the prior art of record discloses or suggests a multifunctional outlet strip having both light and body-detecting sensors, and a motion condition setting part in which a user switches and sets whether a light sensor is used alone, or whether a light sensor and a body-detecting sensor are used at the same time, in combination with the remaining claimed features.

Conclusion

20. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The US patents f Schreiber (5,424,903), Song (5,483,464), Nguyen (5,506,790), Scheurich (5,721,934), Chin (6,573,619), Ewing et al. (7,043,543), Wolpert et al. (7,151,234), and Palmer et al. (7,193,335) disclose similar outlet strips.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hal I. Kaplan whose telephone number is 571-272-8587. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Sherry can be reached on 571-272-2084. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael J Sherry/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2836

hik